

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 15-17. These sheets, which include Figs. 15-17, replace the original sheets including Figs. 15-17. In particular, Figs. 15-17 have been labeled “prior art.”

Attachment: Replacement Sheets (2)

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated April 19, 2006. New claim 27 has been added. Thus, claims 1-2 and 5-27 are now pending. Non-elected claims 7-20 are currently withdrawn.

Figs. 15-17 have been labeled “prior art” as requested by the Examiner. See section 4 of the Office Action.

Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Condie. This Section 102(b) rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 25 as amended requires that “each of said opposed members includes a plurality of holding members for respectively holding flexible substrates, and wherein each of the holding members consists of a single finger so that immediately adjacent holding members do not contact each other.” For example and without limitation, Fig. 1(d) of the instant application illustrates that each of said opposed members includes a plurality of holding members 5 for respectively holding flexible substrates 4, and wherein each of the holding members 5 *consists of a single finger* so that immediately adjacent holding members 5 do not contact each other. See also pg. 12, lines 22-26 of the instant specification, for example and without limitation.

Condie fails to disclose or suggest the aforesaid underlined features of claim 25. In particular, Condie’s alleged holding members (60, 80, 160, 180, 400, 430, etc.) are *U-shaped* and thus each have two fingers, and therefore do not “consist of a single finger” as required by amended claim 25. Moreover, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have modified Condie to meet the invention of amended claim 25 because elimination of the U-shaped holding members of Condie would prevent Condie’s device from being adjusted as Condie desires as evidenced by

Figs. 10-11 and 25-26. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 25 be withdrawn.

Claim 1 as amended requires that "each of said holding members has a single finger." Again, the cited art fails to disclose or suggest this feature.

Claim 27 requires that "*each of the holding members consists of a single finger so that immediately adjacent holding members do not contact each other.*" Condie fails to disclose or suggest this features of claim 27. In particular, Condie's alleged holding members (60, 80, 160, 180, 400, 430, etc.) are *U-shaped* and thus each have two fingers, and therefore do not "consist of a single finger" as required by claim 27. Moreover, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have modified Condie to meet the invention of claim 27 because elimination of the U-shaped holding members of Condie would prevent Condie's device from being adjusted as Condie desires as evidenced by Figs. 10-11 and 25-26.

It is respectfully requested that all rejections be withdrawn. All claims are in condition for allowance. If any minor matter remains to be resolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned with regard to the same.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYTE P.C.

By: 

Joseph A. Rhoa
Reg. No. 37,515

JAR:caj
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100